

REMARKS

§ 112

Claims 13 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite. The amendments to claims 13 and 24 are believed to overcome the rejection.

§ 102

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Gudjonsson. As amended, claim 1 calls for enabling the storage of a modifiable list of selected second terminals that a first terminal is able to communicate with, said list maintained and modified by a first user, and based on said list, enabling communications between said first and second terminals when a second user is using said first terminal. It is respectfully submitted that Gudjonsson fails to disclose storing a modifiable list of selected second terminals that is maintained and modified by a first user, and based on the list, allowing communications between a first terminal and a second terminal when a second user is using the first terminal.

For example, in the Office action it is indicated that Gudjonsson discloses the ability to restrict modifications of a list via authentication. It is respectfully submitted that the cited passages of Gudjonsson merely refer to a “buddy list” that is set up by the user and that may be modified by the user. In other words, the user is in control of who is on his or her own list. There is no reference in the Office action that Gudjonsson’s list is used to limit communications of a second user to those persons (or the terminal associated with the person) listed on the list.

In contrast, according to one implementation of the present invention, a communication protocol particularly amenable to use by children enables communications without the fear that the children will inappropriately communicate with unauthorized individuals. For example, in an embodiment, a list of authorized individuals that a given child may communicate with may be stored on a communication terminal. Before communications are allowed to proceed over a communication network such as the Internet, a check ensures that the intended recipient or sender is an appropriate authorized recipient or sender. In one embodiment, a password protection scheme may be utilized to prevent the child from adding inappropriate contacts to the list of authorized individuals. Gudjonsson fails to address restricting communications based on a list that is not modifiable by a user of his system. Thus, Gudjonsson fails to anticipate amended claim 1 and claims dependent thereon.


Under a similar analysis, amended claims 11 and 21 and respective dependent claims are believed to be patentable over Gudjonsson.

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0456US)

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 24, 2004



Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Customer No.: 21906